

4203

A

LETTER

TO

Mr. *WILLIAM MASON*,

ON READING HIS
AFFECTIONATE ADDRESS.



Civis.

K

The Third Edition.

LONDON: Printed, 1776.

4203



Mr. WILLIAM MASON.

S I R,

I HAVE read your affectionate address, in which you insist, that if we worship God we must honour the King, though he be as bad as NERO was, "we have nothing to do with his ill conduct, nor hear or speak ill of dignities let their behaviour be what it may."

If this doctrine is true, what King am I to honour? Surely not the present King of England, who now enjoys the throne, for he is seated there by force; a *Stewart* then is our lawful sovereign; therefore, if you pray for the present King to be established upon the throne of England, you are sinning against God, and a rebel to ~~the~~ lawful King. For if *James Stewart* was as bad as NERO, you dare not call him to account, consequently he by force is robbed of his crown. This is the rock on which the writers at present in favour of the ministry split; they set out from wrong premises and draw bad conclusions. England hath nothing to do with the manners, laws, or customs of other countries; but have a settled form of government fixed between the king and people. Before a King of England is entrusted with the

the crown, He swears to Almighty God, before the people, that he will support the constitution inviolably.

James Stewart, broke his coronation oath, and consequently was cut off, (though I do not remember he established the Romish religion, by a law in any province of the British empire) otherwise had he continued strictly to the constitution, he would have now enjoyed the crown. David told Solomon, if his seed kept to the laws, he knew there would not be wanting one of his offspring to sway the *Jewish* sceptre; but as they did not keep to the laws they were cut off. So long as a King of England adheres to the constitution, he is the Lord's anointed, and must be honoured; but if he deviates from it he breaks his oath, and all obligations is void. He is bound to the subject in like manner as the subject is to the King; for He is made by the subject, but the subject not by him.

Therefore, the voice of the people should always be adhered to by the King. As long as Saul kept to the law, he was honoured as a King; but when he departed from it, he was cut off from the people. When a King breaks in upon the constitution, he is as much a sinner, as a subject when he offends the laws. All powers are ordained of God, and will retain their power if they continue in his goodness, otherwise they will be cut off. The present family stand on probation, let them take heed not to be high-minded, but fear, for if God spared not the natural branches, let the present be careful lest He spare not them. Every man, who by flattery or writing buoys up a sovereign in any unconstitutional conduct, is
finning

finning against God, and an enemy to his country, and ruining his King.

Passive obedience and non resistance, the doctrine the present Ministry, with their colleagues, seem determined to establish, (propagated by Mr. *Westley* and other Clergy) which when refuted by the most cogent reasoning as contrary to the British constitution, the abettors have had no other recourse but slanderous aspersions and personal invectives;—this I have observed in the house as well as out of doors.—It is notorious: the contrary doctrine, resistance, is the bulwark and life of the constitution of the British empire, through which his Majesty enjoys the throne; which doctrine, being so ably investigated by the house of Lords in 1710, I thought the reciting it from SYDNEY's history of England, would be agreeable to the reader.

“ The debates in the House of Lords became so
 “ interesting that the Queen herself was present.—The
 “ Earl of *Wharton* observed, that *Sacheverel's* doctrine
 “ of passive obedience, might have the most serious
 “ and dangerous consequences, that the principle of
 “ resistance was the corner stone of the revolution;
 “ that to suppose it unlawful, was to suppose that a
 “ great part of the people and the parliament itself,
 “ guilty of rebellion and injustice; that of consequence the present Government could not be considered as lawful, because the Queens right was wholly derived from the revolution.”—“ *Burnet*
 “ Bishop of *Salisbury*, the famous partisan of WILLIAM,
 “ justified resistance from history, both antient and
 “ modern. He alledged the examples of the
 “ *Maccabees*, the *Dutch*, the conduct of ELIZABETH
 in

“ in their behalf, and the succour granted to the
 “ *Hugonots*; adding, that though the contrary o-
 “ pinion had prevailed, those who affected to sup-
 “ port ‘it were the first to plead for resistance when
 “ they saw themselves oppressed.” “ The Bishop
 “ of *Bath and Wells*, who was more a Tory in his
 “ principles than *Burnet*, agreed, that resistance might
 “ be lawful in certain extraordinary cases; but add-
 “ ed, that the doctrine ought not to be propagated
 “ among the people, who would be ready on many
 “ occasions to abuse it; and that the Revolution,
 “ which should rather be called a VOCATION, ought
 “ not to be cited; that the term original contract, if
 “ not used with great reserve, might inspire the most
 “ pernicious principles, and that obedience could not
 “ be preached with too much zeal, when resistance
 “ was supported with indiscreet apologies. These
 “ reflections irritated the Duke of *Argyle*; he asserted,
 “ that the clergy had in all ages abandoned the
 “ interest of the people, and extolled the majesty
 “ of kings, that they may govern them with more
 “ ease; and that this was a sufficient reason why they
 “ should not interfere in political matters. Several
 “ of the most distinguished Tories owned, that the
 “ Doctor’s sermons were extravagant and absurd, but
 “ insisted they were not sufficient to condemn him;
 “ he was, however, found guilty by a majority of
 “ of seven votes, on which he was suspended from the
 “ pulpit for three years, and his sermons condemned
 “ to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman;
 “ together with the famous decree of the uni-
 “ versity of *Oxford*, in favour of absolute authority,
 “ and the irrevocable right of Kings.”

While

While the King walks on the constitutional line, which he is sworn to keep sacred, doubtless he is the anointed of the Lord, if he thus keep in his goodness; otherwise will be cut off by the laws of God and nature. The covenant being fulfilled, the ties are binding; but when broke, dissolved.

It is a well known truth, as hath been observed, that the Kings of England, and the people, have settled the rules of constitution for the British empire, on a firm and lasting footing; they delegate the King with the power of the sceptre, on condition he swear to Almighty God, that he will preserve the constitution in church and state, then is anointed King; but not to swerve to the right hand or to the left; the state to be governed in every province by king and parliament, who are to watch over, and take care to enact such wholesome laws, as shall be for the good of the whole province they represent; and that all provinces under the British empire, should enjoy the same privileges as Great Britain in parliament, make laws and tax their own province. This is the constitution as appears by *Ireland*, and all the provinces in *North America*, with the *West India* islands, having two houses of assemblies, which are exactly the same as our two houses of parliament, the King at the head of every parliament or assembly; so that any act proposed and agreed to by both houses, in any province of the British empire, is not binding until the King's signet is set to it; every province annexed to the British dominions has a right to the constitutional law of the empire. Great Britain, the mother country, for nourishing and protecting them has rightly the supreme command of the commerce of every province;

vince ; in this lay's the right of Great Britains supremacy over all her dominions.

The Protestant churches to bear rule in every province, however, the Roman churches might be tolerated; now I want to know how came this innovation of the constitution in church and state, the Roman religion made by a law the ruling church in *Canada*, the *English* constitution set aside, and another contrary to it established; one province tax another, not known before this reign? Indeed it is contrary to the British constitution for one province to tax another without they were represented; every county in *England* is represented, and if they tax me they do it feelingly, for they lay the same on themselves; but were the *English* parliament to tax *America*, they would feel nothing of it themselves, therefore may lay it on unreasonably as they please, they feel it not; it is not only unconstitutional, but in every point of view unreasonable. But, why do I wonder, when even in our own kingdom, the King is advised, and actually did step from the constitutional throne, into a despotic chair, and gave the *Portland* estate (formerly granted to that family and their heirs) to *Lowther*? But the constitutional law checked him, and settled him back on the British throne; but again, He leaves the throne, and attacks the grants of the crown in *America*; and in order, still further, to infringe on the constitution, gives his sceptre to the parliament of one province, and they weak enough receive it, and tax the *Americans*; they might as well have taxed *Ireland*. Why had not the Monarch caused estimates, and constitutionally laid before each assembly, what he wanted to support the dignity of the
the

the British empire? It will not avail to say, if the King had, they would not have raised any; this is begging the question, has it been tried, or were they found wanting, last war?

Oh how happy would the King of the British empire be, was he not to swerve from the constitutional line! He would reign in the hearts of his subjects in general, neither would they mind the 600,000 l. out of the civil list, any more than the 800,000 l. annually granted to support his dignity. The ministry fixed in every department would take off the weight of government from him; no bribery nor corruption, in order to get a majority to carry on an unconstitutional plan, would be wanting; if any man, still clamorous, he would be despised by almost all the kingdom. But this lust after power, this brat of hell, is the ruin of love and harmony. It is alarming to every lover of the *Brunswick* line, to hear the Papists and those that would, if called upon, spend their lives and fortunes for the *Stewart* family, praising the proceedings of the present ministry; it cannot be for any other motive, but to get the king despised, and thereby open a way for the *Stewarts* family to the throne; but, I hope God will frustrate the counsel and designs of that whore of *Babylon*, that *Ahitophel*, screened behind the throne, open the Monarch's eyes, that he may spurn the rebels to the *English* constitution from surrounding him, and then he would soon reign in the hearts of his people.

Grace-Church-Street,

10 JAN 66

CIVIS.

E T N I S

